



Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address: VISTA SURGICAL CENTER WEST 6371 RICHMOND AVE SUITE 102 HOUSTON TX 77057	MFDR Tracking #: M4-03-2103-01
	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #: TRANSCONTINENTAL INSURANCE CO Box #: 47	Date of Injury:
	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary taken from the *Table of Disputed services* states: "Carrier denied per code 'F' which is not applicable to treatment or service for which no 'MAR' is established. Per the Commission instructions, code 'F' cannot be used to deny or reduce payment for billed services for which there is no 'MAR.' Therefore, denial is inappropriate."

Amount in Dispute: \$5,782.81

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

The insurance carrier did not respond to the DWC060 request.

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
1/29/2002	F	Outpatient Surgery	\$5,782.81	\$0.00
			Total Due:	\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective October 7, 1991 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on December 31, 2002. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, the Division notified the requestor on January 15, 2003 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

- For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:
 - F-Reduction according to fee guidelines
- This dispute relates to outpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1(f) effective October 7, 1991, 16 TexReg 5210, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, sec. 8.21(b) [currently Texas Labor Code §413.011(d)], until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission.
- Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.

4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(1)(A), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires that the request shall include “a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier for reconsideration...” Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include a copy of the medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier for reconsideration. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(1)(A).
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “documentation of the request for and response to reconsideration (when a provider is requesting dispute resolution on a carrier reduction or denial of a medical bill) or, if the carrier failed to respond to the request for reconsideration, convincing evidence of the carrier’s receipt of that request.” Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not provided documentation of the insurance carrier’s response to the request for reconsideration or convincing evidence of the carrier’s receipt of that request. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “a copy of any pertinent medical records.” Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not provide a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “the requestor’s reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid.” Review of the submitted documentation finds no documentation of the requestor’s reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii).
10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor’s position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(IV).
11. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 2, 2002, 26 TexReg 10934, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2002, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor has not articulated a methodology under which fair and reasonable reimbursement should be calculated.
 - The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of \$5,782.81 would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
 - The requestor did not support that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

12. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(A), §133.307(g)(3)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

Authorized Signature

Margaret Q. Ojeda

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

February 17, 2011

Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.